

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

ONE WISCONSIN INSTITUTE, INC.,
CITIZEN ACTION OF WISCONSIN EDUCATION
FUND, INC., RENEE M. GAGNER,
ANITA JOHNSON, CODY R. NELSON,
JENNIFER S. TASSE, SCOTT T. TRINDL,
MICHAEL R. WILDER, JOHNNY M. RANDLE,
DAVID WALKER, DAVID APONTE, and
CASSANDRA M. SILAS,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ORDER

15-cv-324-jdp

MARK L. THOMSEN, ANN S. JACOBS,
BEVERLY R. GILL, JULIE M. GLANCEY,
STEVE KING, DON M. MILLS,
MICHAEL HAAS, MARK GOTTLIEB, and
KRISTINA BOARDMAN,
all in their official capacities,

Defendants.

JUSTIN LUFT, et al.,
on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ORDER

20-cv-768-jdp

TONY EVERS, et al.,

Defendants.

A scheduling conference was held before District Judge James D. Peterson. Plaintiffs in *One Wisconsin* appeared by Bruce Van Spiva, Charles Curtis, and Amanda Callais. Plaintiffs in *Luft* appeared by Karyn Rotker and Alora Thomas. Defendants appeared by Michael Murphy, Gabe Johnson-Karp, and Jody Schmelzer.

The court set the following schedule:

September 18: The parties will file cross motions on any substantive issues to be decided before the election. The briefs should be structured around the flaws this court previously found in the IDPP. Plaintiffs should identify any flaws that remain and propose a remedy; defendants should explain why the current application of the IDPP is adequate and should also address the feasibility of any remedies proposed by plaintiffs. Both sides should use this court's previous rulings to provide the framework, along with any guidance provided by the court of appeals in *Frank* or *Luft*.

September 22: The parties will file their responses. Both sides should state their position on whether they believe a hearing is needed.

September 25: The court will hold a hearing at 1:00 p.m., if needed. The primary purpose of the hearing will be to conduct an oral argument, but the parties may call witnesses if they believe that would be helpful. The parties should assume that a hearing will be held unless the court instructs otherwise.

October 1: The projected date of a decision.

The court will not set a specific schedule for discovery. Defendants have already provided a substantial number of documents to plaintiffs. The parties agreed that they would attempt to decide among themselves what other discovery is needed.

Entered August 25, 2020.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

JAMES D. PETERSON
District Judge